arXiv:1610.08456v1 [math.CV] 19 Oct 2016

SECOND MAIN THEOREM FOR MEROMORPHIC MAPPINGS WITH MOVING HYPERSURFACES IN SUBGENERAL POSITION

SI DUC QUANG

Abstract. Let f be an algebraically nondegenerate meromorphic mapping from $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ and let $Q_1, ..., Q_q$ be q hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ of degree d_i, in $N-$subgeneral position. In this paper, we will prove that, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer M such that

$$|| \ (q - (N-n+1)(n+1) - \epsilon)T_f(r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d_i} N^{[M]}(r, f^*Q_i) + o(T_f(r)).$$

Moreover, an explicit estimate for M is given. Our result is an extension of the previous second main theorems for meromorphic mappings and moving hyperplanes or moving hypersurfaces.

1. Introduction

Let f be a meromorphic mapping from $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ with a reduced representation $\tilde{f} = (f_0, ..., f_n)$. For each meromorphic mapping a from $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})^*$, which is usually called a moving hyperplane, with a reduced representation $\tilde{a} = (a_0, ..., a_n)$ such that $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{a}) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} a_j f_j \not\equiv 0$, we denote by f^*a the zero divisor of $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{a})$. We see that f^*a is defined independently from the choices of $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{a}$, and is called the intersecting divisor of f with a. We denote by $N^{[M]}(r, f^*a)$ or $N^{[M]}_{(f,a)}(r)$ the counting function of f^*a (see Section 2 for the definitions). As usual, we denote by $T_f(r)$ the characteristic function of f with respect to the hyperplane line bundle of $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$.

Let $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^q$ be moving hyperplanes of $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ with reduce representations $\tilde{a}_i = (a_{i0}, \ldots, a_{in})$. Let $N \geq n$ and $q \geq N+1$. We say that the family $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^q$ is in *N-subgeneral position* if for every subset $R \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, q\}$ with the cardinality $|R| = N+1$,

$$\text{rank}_{\mathcal{M}}\{\tilde{a}_i \mid i \in R\} = n+1,$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ denotes the field consisting of all meromorphic functions on $\mathbf{C}^m$. If they are in n-subgeneral position, we simply say that they are in *general position*. We also denote by $\mathcal{K}_{\{a_i\}_{i=1}^q}$ the smallest subfield of $\mathcal{M}$, which contains $\mathbf{C}$ and all $\frac{a_{ij}}{a_{ik}}$ for $a_{ik} \not\equiv 0$.

In 1991, W. Stoll - M. Ru [18, 19] and M. Shirosaki [20] independdently proved the following second main theorem.

Theorem A (cf. [18, 19, 20]). *Let $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^q$ be q hyperplanes of $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ in general position. Let $f : \mathbf{C}^m \to \mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ be a meromorphic mapping such that f is linearly nondegenerate*

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 32H30; Secondary 30D35, 32A22.
Key words and phrases: Second main theorem, meromorphic mapping, moving hypersurface, uniqueness problem, truncated multiplicity.

over $\mathcal{K}_{\{a_i\}_{i=1}^q}$. *Then for every* $\epsilon > 0$, *we have*

$$\| \ \ (q-n-1-\epsilon)T_f(r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} N(r, f^*a_i) + o(T_f(r)).$$

Here, by the notation "$\|P$" we mean that the assertion P holds for all $r \in [0,\infty)$ excluding a Borel subset E of the interval $[0,\infty)$ with $\int_E dr < \infty$.

The above second main theorem plays an important role in Nevanlinna theory, with many applications to Algebraic or Analytic geometry. We note that in the above result, the mapping f is assumed to be linearly nondegenerate over the field $\mathcal{K}_{\{a_i\}_{i=1}^q}$. To treat the case where f may be degenerate, we need consider the case where the hyperplanes may be not in general position, but in subgeneral position. Thanks the notion of Nochka weights introduced by Nochka [9], D. D. Thai and S. D. Quang [21] gave the following second main theorem for the case where the family of hyperplanes is in subgeneral position.

Theorem B (cf. [21]). *Let* $f : \mathbf{C}^m \longrightarrow \mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ *be a nonconstant meromorphic mapping. Let* $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^q$ *be meromorphic mappings of* $\mathbf{C}^m$ *into* $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})^*$ *in* N*-subgeneral position such that* a_i *are slow with respect to* f *and* f *is linearly nondegenerate over* $\mathcal{K}_{\{a_i\}_{i=1}^q}$. *Then for an arbitrary* $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$\| \ \ (q-2N+n-1-\epsilon)T_f(r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} N^{[M]}(r, f^*a_i) + o(T_f(r)),$$

where M *is a positive integer (explicitly estimated).*

A natural question here is *"how to generalize these results to the case where hyperplanes are replaced by hypersurfaces"*. By proposing a new technique (using a result of Corvaja and Zannier [4] on the dimension of spaces of homogeneous polynomials), in 2004, M. Ru [17] proved a second main theorem for algebraically nondegenerate meromorphic mappings into $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{C})$ intersecting hypersurfaces in general position in $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{C})$. He proved the following.

Theorem C (cf. [17]). *Let* $f : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ *be an algebraically nondegenerate meromorphic mapping and let* $Q_1, ..., Q_q$ *be* q *hypersurfaces in* $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ *of degree* d_i, *in general position. Then, for every* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\| \ (q-n-1-\epsilon)T_f(r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d_i} N(r, f^*Q_i) + o(T_f(r)).$$

With the same assumptions, T. T. H. An and H. T. Phuong [1] improved the result of M. Ru by giving an explicit truncation level for counting functions. Recently, in [14] we have generalized the results of M. Ru and T. T. H. An - H. T. Phuong to the following.

Theorem D (cf. [14]). *Let* $f : \mathbf{C}^m \to \mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ *be an algebraically nondegenerate meromorphic mapping and let* $Q_1, ..., Q_q$ *be hypersurfaces in* $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ *of degree* d_i, *in* N*-subgeneral position. Then, for every* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\| \ (q-(N-n+1)(n+1)-\epsilon)T_f(r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d_i} N^{[M_0-1]}_{Q_i(f)}(r) + o(T_f(r)),$$

where M_0 is positive integer (explicitly estimated).

For the case of moving hypersurface, recently G. Dethloff and T. V. Tan [5] generalized the second main theorems of M. Ru to the following.

Theorem E (Dethloff - Tan [5]) *Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic map of $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$. Let $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$ be a set of slowly (with respect to f) moving hypersurfaces in weakly general position with $\deg Q_j = d_j$ $(1 \le i \le q)$. Assume that f is algebraically nondegenerate over $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q}$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist positive integers L_j $(j = 1, ..., q)$, depending only on n, ϵ and d_j $(j = 1, ..., q)$ in an explicit way such that*

$$|| \ (q - n - 1 - \epsilon)T_f(r) \le \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d_i} N_{Q_i(f)}^{[L_j]}(r) + o(T_f(r)).$$

Here, $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}$ denotes the field generated by $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$ (see Section 2 for the definition).

Our purpose in this paper is to generalize all these above mentioned results to the case of moving hypersurfaces in subgeneral position. We will prove a second main theorem for meromorphic mappings into $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ intersecting a family of moving hypersurfaces in subgeneral position with truncated counting functions. Namely, we will prove the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic map of $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$. Let $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$ be a family of slowly (with respect to f) moving hypersurfaces in weakly $N-$subgeneral position with $\deg Q_j = d_j$ $(1 \le i \le q)$. Assume that f is algebraically nondegenerate over $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q}$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$|| \ (q - (N - n + 1)(n + 1) - \epsilon)T_f(r) \le \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d_i} N_{Q_i(f)}^{[L_j]}(r) + o(T_f(r)),$$

where $L_j = \frac{1}{d_j} L_0$ and L_0 is a positive number which is defined by:

$$L_0 := \binom{L+n}{n} p_0^{\binom{L+n}{n}\left(\binom{L+n}{n}-1\right)\binom{q}{n}-2} - 1$$

$$\text{with} \quad L := (n+1)d + 2(N-n+1)(n+1)^3 I(\epsilon^{-1})d$$

$$\text{and} \quad p_0 := [\frac{\binom{L+n}{n}\left(\binom{L+n}{n}-1\right)\binom{q}{n}-1}{\log(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)})}]^2.$$

Here, by $I(x)$ we denote the smallest integer which is not less than x. We see that, if the family of moving hypersurfaces is in general position, i.e., $N = n$, then our result will imply the second main theorem of G. Dethloff and T. V. Tan. Our idea to avoid using the Nochka weights here is that from every $N + 1$ arbitrary moving hypersurfaces in weakly $N-$subgeneral position we will construct $n + 1$ new moving hypersurfaces in weakly general position (see Lemma 3.1).

Let Q be a moving hypersurface of $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$. We define the truncated defect of f with respect to Q by

$$\delta_f^{[L]}(D) = 1 - \liminf \frac{N^{[M]}(r, f^*Q)}{dT_f(r)}.$$

From the above theorem, we have the following defect relation for meromorphic mappings with a family of moving hypersurfaces as follows.

Corollary 1.2. *Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic map of $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$. Let $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$ be a family of slowly (with respect to f) moving hypersurfaces in weakly $N-$subgeneral position with $\deg Q_j = d_j$ $(1 \leq i \leq q)$. Assume that f is algebraically nondegenerate over $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q}$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{q} \delta_f^{[L_0]}(D) \leq (N-n+1)(n+1).$$

2. Basic notions and auxiliary results from Nevanlinna theory

2.1. The first main theorem in Nevanlinna theory

We set $||z|| = \left(|z_1|^2 + \cdots + |z_m|^2\right)^{1/2}$ for $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_m) \in \mathbf{C}^m$ and define

$$B(r) := \{z \in \mathbf{C}^m : ||z|| < r\}, \quad S(r) := \{z \in \mathbf{C}^m : ||z|| = r\} \ (0 < r < \infty).$$

Define

$$v_{m-1}(z) := \left(dd^c||z||^2\right)^{m-1} \qquad \text{and}$$

$$\sigma_m(z) := d^c\log||z||^2 \wedge \left(dd^c\log||z||^2\right)^{m-1} \text{on} \quad \mathbf{C}^m \setminus \{0\}.$$

Let F be a nonzero meromorphic function on a domain Ω in $\mathbf{C}^m$. For a set $\alpha = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_m)$ of nonnegative integers, we set $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + ... + \alpha_m$ and

$$\mathcal{D}^\alpha F = \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} F}{\partial^{\alpha_1} z_1 ... \partial^{\alpha_m} z_m}.$$

We denote by ν_F^0, ν_F^∞ and ν_F the zero divisor, the pole divisor, and the divisor of the meromorphic function F respectively.

For a divisor ν on $\mathbf{C}^m$ and for a positive integer M or $M = \infty$, we set

$$\nu^{[M]}(z) = \min\{M, \nu(z)\},$$

$$n(t) = \begin{cases} \int\limits_{|\nu| \cap B(t)} \nu(z) v_{m-1} & \text{if } m \geq 2, \\ \sum\limits_{|z| \leq t} \nu(z) & \text{if } m = 1. \end{cases}$$

The counting function of ν is defined by

$$N(r, \nu) = \int_1^r \frac{n(t)}{t^{2m-1}} dt \quad (1 < r < \infty).$$

Similarly, we define $N(r, \nu^{[M]})$ and denote it by $N^{[M]}(r, \nu)$.

Let $\varphi : \mathbf{C}^m \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ be a meromorphic function. Define

$$N_\varphi(r) = N(r, \nu_\varphi^0), \ N_\varphi^{[M]}(r) = N^{[M]}(r, \nu_\varphi^0).$$

For brevity we will omit the character $^{[M]}$ if $M = \infty$.

Let $f : \mathbf{C}^m \longrightarrow \mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ be a meromorphic mapping. For arbitrarily fixed homogeneous coordinates $(w_0 : \cdots : w_n)$ on $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$, we take a reduced representation $\tilde{f} = (f_0, \ldots, f_n)$, which means that each f_i is a holomorphic function on $\mathbf{C}^m$ and $f(z) = \big(f_0(z) : \cdots : f_n(z)\big)$ outside the analytic set $\{f_0 = \cdots = f_n = 0\}$ of codimension ≥ 2. Set $\|\tilde{f}\| = \big(|f_0|^2 + \cdots + |f_n|^2\big)^{1/2}$. The characteristic function of f is defined by

$$T_f(r) = \int\limits_{S(r)} \log \|\tilde{f}\| \sigma_m - \int\limits_{S(1)} \log \|\tilde{f}\| \sigma_m.$$

Let φ be a nonzero meromorphic function on $\mathbf{C}^m$, which are occasionally regarded as a meromorphic map into $\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbf{C})$. The proximity function of φ is defined by

$$m(r, \varphi) := \int_{S(r)} \log \max\, (|\varphi|, 1) \sigma_m.$$

The Nevanlinna's characteristic function of φ is defined as follows

$$T(r, \varphi) := N_{\frac{1}{\varphi}}(r) + m(r, \varphi).$$

Then

$$T_\varphi(r) = T(r, \varphi) + O(1).$$

The function φ is said to be small (with respect to f) if $||\ T_\varphi(r) = o(T_f(r))$.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}$ (resp. $\mathcal{K}_f$) the field of all meromorphic functions (resp. small meromorphic functions with respect to f) on $\mathbf{C}^m$.

2.2. Family of moving hypersurfaces

We recall some following due to [12, 13].

Denote by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}^m}$ the ring of all holomorphic functions on $\mathbf{C}^m$. Let Q be a homogeneous polynomial in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}^m}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ of degree $d \geq 1$. Denote by $Q(z)$ the homogeneous polynomial over $\mathbf{C}$ obtained by substituting a specific point $z \in \mathbf{C}^m$ into the coefficients of Q. We also call a moving hypersurface in $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ each homogeneous polynomial $Q \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}^m}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ such that the common zero set of all coefficients of Q has codimension at least two.

Let Q be a moving hypersurface in $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ of degree $d \geq 1$ given by

$$Q(z) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{T}_d} a_I \omega^I,$$

where $\mathcal{T}_d = \{(i_0, ..., i_n) \in \mathbf{N}_0^{n+1}\ ;\ i_0 + \cdots + i_n = d\}$, $a_I \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}^m}$ and $\omega^I = \omega_0^{i_0} \cdots \omega_n^{i_n}$. We consider the meromorphic mapping $Q' : \mathbf{C}^m \to \mathbf{P}^N(\mathbf{C})$, where $N = \binom{n+d}{n}$, given by

$$Q'(z) = (a_{I_0}(z) : \cdots : a_{I_N}(z))\ (\mathcal{T}_d = \{I_0, ..., I_N\}).$$

Here $I_0 < \cdots < I_N$ in the lexicographic ordering. By chainging the homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ if neccesary, we may assume that for each given moving hypersurface as above, $a_{I_0} \not\equiv 0$ (note that $I_0 = (0, \ldots, 0, d)$ and a_{I_0} is the coefficient of ω_n^d). We set

$$\tilde{Q} = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \frac{a_{I_j}}{a_{I_0}} \omega^{I_j}.$$

The moving hypersurfaces Q is said to be "slow" (with respect to f) if $||\ T_{Q'}(r) = o(T_f(r))$. This is equivalent to $||T_{\frac{a_{I_j}}{a_{I_0}}}(r) = o(T_f(r))$ $(\forall 1 \leq j \leq N)$, i.e., $\frac{a_{I_j}}{a_{I_0}} \in \mathcal{K}_f$.

Let $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$ be a family of moving hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$, $\deg Q_i = d_i$. Assume that

$$Q_i = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{d_i}} a_{iI}\omega^I.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q}$ the smallest subfield of $\mathcal{M}$ which contains $\mathbf{C}$ and all $\frac{a_{iI}}{a_{iJ}}$ with $a_{iJ} \not\equiv 0$. We say that $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$ are in weakly N-subgeneral position $(N \geq n)$ if there exists $z \in \mathbf{C}^m$ such that all a_{iI} $(1 \leq i \leq q,\ I \in \mathcal{I})$ are holomorphic at z and for any $1 \leq i_0 < \cdots < i_N \leq q$ the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} Q_{i_j}(z)(w_0, \ldots, w_n) = 0 \\ 0 \leq j \leq N \end{cases}$$

has only the trivial solution $w = (0, \ldots, 0)$ in $\mathbf{C}^{n+1}$. If $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$ is in weakly $n-$subgeneral position then we say that it is in weakly general position.

2.3. Some theorems and lemmas

Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic map of $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_f$ the set of all non-negative functions $h : \mathbf{C}^m \setminus A \longrightarrow [0, +\infty] \subset \overline{\mathbf{R}}$, which are of the form

$$h = \frac{|g_1| + \cdots + |g_l|}{|g_{l+1}| + \cdots + |g_{l+k}|},$$

where $k, l \in \mathbf{N},\ g_1, ..., g_{l+k} \in \mathcal{K}_f \setminus \{0\}$ and $A \subset \mathbf{C}^m$, which may depend on $g_1, ..., g_{l+k}$, is an analytic subset of codimension at least two. Then, for $h \in \mathcal{C}_f$ we have

$$\int\limits_{S(r)} \log h\sigma_m = o(T_f(r)).$$

Lemma 2.1 (see [5]). *Let $\{Q_i\}_{i=0}^n$ be a set of homogeneous polynomials of degree d in $\mathcal{K}_f[x_0, ..., x_n]$. Then there exists a function $h_1 \in \mathcal{C}_f$ such that, outside an analytic set of $\mathbf{C}^m$ of codimension at least two,*

$$\max_{i \in \{0,\ldots,n\}} |Q_i(f_0, ..., f_n)| \leq h_1||f||^d.$$

If, moreover, this set of homogeneous polynomials is in weakly general position, then there exists a nonzero function $h_2 \in \mathcal{C}_f$ such that, outside an analytic set of $\mathbf{C}^m$ of codimension at least two,

$$h_2||f||^d \leq \max_{i \in \{0,\ldots,n\}} |Q_i(f_0, ..., f_n)|.$$

Lemma 2.2 (Lemma on logarithmic derivative, see [10]). *Let f be a nonzero meromorphic function on $\mathbf{C}^m$. Then*

$$\Big|\Big| \quad m\bigg(r, \frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha(f)}{f}\bigg) = O(\log^+ T(r, f))\ (\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}_+^m).$$

Repeating the argument in (Prop. 4.5 [6]), we have the following.

Proposition 2.3 (see [6, Prop. 4.5]). *Let $\Phi_1, ..., \Phi_k$ be meromorphic functions on $\mathbf{C}^m$ such that $\{\Phi_1, ..., \Phi_k\}$ are linearly independent over $\mathbf{C}$. Then there exists an admissible set*

$$\{\alpha_i = (\alpha_{i1}, ..., \alpha_{im})\}_{i=1}^k \subset \mathbf{Z}_+^m$$

with $|\alpha_i| = \sum_{j=1}^m |\alpha_{ij}| \leq i-1$ $(1 \leq i \leq k)$ such that the following are satisfied:

(i) $\{\mathcal{D}^{\alpha_i}\Phi_1, ..., \mathcal{D}^{\alpha_i}\Phi_k\}_{i=1}^k$ is linearly independent over $\mathcal{M}$, i.e., $\det(\mathcal{D}^{\alpha_i}\Phi_j) \not\equiv 0$,

(ii) $\det\big(\mathcal{D}^{\alpha_i}(h\Phi_j)\big) = h^k \cdot \det\big(\mathcal{D}^{\alpha_i}\Phi_j\big)$ for any nonzero meromorphic function h on $\mathbf{C}^m$.

The next general form of second main theorem for hyperplanes is due to M. Ru [16]

Theorem 2.4 (see [16, Theorem 2.3]). *Let f be a linealy nondegenerate meromorphic mapping of $\mathbf{C}^m$ in $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ with a reduced representation $\tilde{f} = (f_0, ..., f_n)$ and let $H_1, .., H_q$ be q arbitrary hyperplanes in $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$. Then we have*

$$|| \int_{S(r)} \max_K \log \left(\prod_{j \in K} \frac{||\tilde{f}||.||H_j||}{|H_j(\tilde{f})|} \sigma_m \right) \leq (n+1) T_f(r) - N_{W^\alpha(f_i)}(r) + o(T_f(r)),$$

where α is an admissible set with respect to $\tilde{f}$ (as in Proposition 2.3) and the maximum is taken over all subsets $K \subset \{1, ..., q\}$ such that $\{H_j \ ; \ j \in K\}$ is linearly indenpendent.

We note that the original theorem of M. Ru states only for the case of holomorphic curves from $\mathbf{C}$. However its proof also is valid for the case of meromorphic mappings from $\mathbf{C}^m$ with a slight modification.

We have some following algebraic lemmas due to [4, 5]

Lemma 2.5 (see [4, Lemma 2.2]). *Let A be a commutative ring and let $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_p\}$ be a regular sequence in A, i.e., for $i = 1, \ldots, p$, ϕ_i is not a zero divisor of $A/(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{i-1})$. Denote by I the ideal in A generated by $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_p$. Suppose that for some $q, q_1, \ldots, q_h \in A$, we have an equation*

$$\phi_1^{i_1} \cdots \phi_p^{i_p} \cdot q = \sum_{r=1}^h \phi_1^{j_1(r)} \cdots \phi_p^{j_p(r)} \cdot q_r,$$

where $(j_1(r), \ldots, j_p(r)) > (i_1, \ldots, i_p)$ for $r = 1, \ldots, h$. Then $q \in I$.

Here, as throughout this paper, we use the lexicographic order on $\mathbf{N}_0^p$. Namely,

$$(j_1, \ldots, j_p) > (i_1, \ldots, i_p)$$

iff for some $s \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ we have $j_l = i_l$ for $l < s$ and $j_s > i_s$.

Lemma 2.6 (see [5, Lemma 3.2]). *Let $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$ $(q \geq n+1)$ be a set of homogeneous polynomials of common degree $d \geq 1$ in $\mathcal{K}_f[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ in weakly general position. Then for any pairwise different $1 \leq j_0, \ldots, j_n \leq q$ the sequence $\{Q_{j_0}, \ldots, Q_{j_n}\}$ of elements in $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ is a regular sequence, as well as all its subsequences.*

3. Second main theorems for moving hypersurfaces

We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $Q_1, ..., Q_{N+1}$ be homogeneous polynomials in $\mathcal{K}_f[x_0, ..., x_n]$ of the same degree $d \geq 1$, in weakly N-subgeneral position. Then there exist n homogeneous polynomials $P_2, ..., P_{n+1}$ in $\mathcal{K}_f[x_0, ..., x_n]$ of the forms*

$$P_t = \sum_{j=2}^{N-n+t} c_{tj} Q_j,\ c_{tj} \in \mathbf{C},\ t = 2, ..., n+1,$$

such that the family $\{P_1, ..., P_{n+1}\}$ is in weakly general position, where $P_1 = Q_1$.

Proof. We assume that Q_i $(1 \leq i \leq N+1)$ has the following form

$$Q_i = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{T}_d} a_{iI} \omega^I.$$

By the definition of the weakly subgeneral position, there exists a point $z_0 \in \mathbf{C}^m$ such that a_{iI} is holomorphic at z_0 for all i and I, and the following system of equations

$$Q_i(z_0)(\omega_0, ..., \omega_n) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq N+1,$$

has only trivial solution $(0, ..., 0)$. We may assume that $Q_i(z_0) \not\equiv 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N+1$.

For each homogeneous polynomials $Q \in \mathbf{C}[x_0, ..., x_n]$, we will denote by Q^* the fixed hypersurface in $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ defined by Q, i.e.,

$$Q^* = \{(\omega_0 : \cdots : \omega_n) \in \mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C}) \mid Q(\omega_0, ..., \omega_n) = 0\}.$$

Setting $P_1 = Q_1$, we see that

$$\dim \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{t} Q_i^*(z_0) \right) \leq N - t + 1,\ t = N - n + 2, ..., N + 1,$$

where $\dim \emptyset = -\infty$.

Step 1. We will construct P_2 as follows. For each irreducible component Γ of dimension $n-1$ of $Q_1^*(z_0)$, we put

$$V_{1\Gamma} = \{c = (c_2, ..., c_{N-n+2}) \in \mathbf{C}^{N-n+1}\ ;\ \Gamma \subset Q_c^*(z_0),\ \text{where } Q_c = \sum_{j=2}^{N-n+2} c_j Q_j\}.$$

Then $V_{1\Gamma}$ is a subspace of $\mathbf{C}^{N-n+1}$. Since $\dim \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{N-n+2} Q_i^*(z_0) \right) \leq n-2$, there exists $i \in \{2, ..., N-n+2\}$ such that $\Gamma \not\subset Q_i^*(z_0)$. This implies that $V_{1\Gamma}$ is a proper subspace of $\mathbf{C}^{N-n+1}$. Since the set of irreducible components of dimension $n-1$ of $Q_1^*(z_0)$ is at most countable,

$$\mathbf{C}^{N-n+1} \setminus \bigcup_{\Gamma} V_{1\Gamma} \neq \emptyset.$$

Hence, there exists $(c_{12}, ..., c_{1(N-n+2)}) \in \mathbf{C}^{N-n+1}$ such that

$$\Gamma \not\subset P_2^*(z_0)$$

for all irreducible components of dimension $n-1$ of $Q_1^*(z_0)$, where $P_2 = \sum_{j=2}^{N-n+2} c_{1j}Q_j$. This clearly implies that $\dim\left(P_1^*(z_0)\cap P_2^*(z_0)\right) \leq n-2$.

Step 2. For each irreducible component Γ' of dimension $n-2$ of $(P_1^*(z_0)\cap P_2^*(z_0))$, put

$$V_{2\Gamma'} = \{c = (c_2, ..., c_{N-n+3}) \in \mathbf{C}^{N-n+2}\ ;\ \Gamma \subset Q_c^*(z_0),\ \text{where } Q_c = \sum_{j=2}^{N-n+3} c_j Q_j\}.$$

Hence, $V_{2\Gamma'}$ is a subspace of $\mathbf{C}^{N-n+2}$. Since $\dim\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{N-n+3} Q_i^*(z_0)\right) \leq n-3$, there exists $i, (2 \leq i \leq N-n+3)$ such that $\Gamma' \not\subset Q_i^*(z_0)$. This implies that $V_{2\Gamma'}$ is a proper subspace of $\mathbf{C}^{N-n+2}$. Since the set of irreducible components of dimension $n-2$ of $(P_1^*(z_0)\cap P_2^*(z_0))$ is at most countable,

$$\mathbf{C}^{N-n+2} \setminus \bigcup_{\Gamma'} V_{2\Gamma'} \neq \emptyset.$$

Then, there exists $(c_{22}, ..., c_{2(N-n+3)}) \in \mathbf{C}^{N-n+2}$ such that

$$\Gamma' \not\subset P_3^*(z_0)$$

for all irreducible components of dimension $n-2$ of $P_1^*(z_0)\cap P_2^*(z_0)$, where $P_3 = \sum_{j=2}^{N-n+3} c_{2j}Q_j$. It is clear that $\dim\left(P_1^*(z_0)\cap P_2^*(z_0)\cap P_3^*(z_0)\right) \leq n-3$.

Repeating again the above step, after the n-th step we get the hypersurfaces $P_2, ..., P_{n+1}$ stisfying that

$$\dim\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{t} P_j^*(z_0)\right) \leq n-t.$$

In particular, $\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n+1} P_j^*(z_0)\right) = \emptyset$. This yields that $P_1, ..., P_{n+1}$ are in weakly general position. We complete the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Replacing Q_i by Q_i^{d/d_i} if neccesary with the note that

$$\frac{1}{d}N^{[L_0]}(r, f^*Q_i^{d/d_i}) \leq \frac{1}{d_i}N^{[L_j]}(r, f^*Q_i),$$

we may assume that all hypersurfaces Q_i $(1 \leq i \leq q)$ are of the same degree d. We may also assume that $q > (N-n+1)(n+1)$.

Consider a reduced representation $\tilde{f} = (f_0, \ldots, f_n) : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{C}^{n+1}$ of f. We also note that

$$N^{[L_0]}_{Q_i(\tilde{f})}(r) = N^{[L_0]}_{\tilde{Q}(\tilde{f})}(r) + o(T_f(r)).$$

Then without loss of generality we may assume that $Q_i \in \mathcal{K}_f[x_0, ..., x_n]$.

We set

$$\mathcal{I} = \{(i_1, ..., i_{N+1})\ ; 1 \leq i_j \leq q, i_j \neq i_t\ \forall j \neq t\}.$$

For each $I = (i_1, ..., i_{N+1}) \in \mathcal{I}$, we denote by $P_{I1}, ..., P_{I(n+1)}$ the hypersurfaces obtained in Lemma 3.1 with respect to the family of hypersurfaces $\{Q_{i_1}, ..., Q_{i_{N+1}}\}$. It is easy to see that there exists a positive function $h \in \mathcal{C}_f$ such that

$$|P_{It}(\omega)| \leq h \max_{1\leq j\leq N+1-n+t} |Q_{i_j}(\omega)|,$$

for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\omega = (\omega_0, ..., \omega_n) \in \mathbf{C}^{n+1}$.

For a fixed point $z \in \mathbf{C} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^q Q_i(\tilde{f})^{-1}(\{0,\infty\})$. We may assume that

$$|Q_{i_1}(\tilde{f})(z)| \le |Q_{i_2}(\tilde{f})(z)| \le \cdots \le |Q_{i_q}(\tilde{f})(z)|.$$

Let $I = (i_1, ..., i_{N+1})$. Since $P_{I1}, \ldots, P_{I(n+1)}$ are in weakly general position, there exist functions $g_0, g \in \mathcal{C}_f$, which may be chosen independent of I and z, such that

$$||\tilde{f}(z)||^d \le g_0(z) \max_{1\le j\le n+1} |P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})(z)| \le g(z)|Q_{i_{N+1}}(z)|.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{i=1}^q \frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d}{|Q_i(\tilde{f})(z)|} &\le g^{q-N}(z) \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d}{|Q_{i_j}(\tilde{f})(z)|} \\
&\le g^{q-N}(z)h^{n-1}(z) \frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^{Nd}}{\left(\prod_{j=2}^{N-n+1} |Q_{i_j}(\tilde{f})(z)|\right)\cdot \prod_{j=1}^n |P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})(z)|} \\
&\le g^{q-N}(z)h^{n-1}(z) \frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^{Nd}}{|P_{I1}(\tilde{f})(z)|^{N-n+1} \cdot \prod_{j=2}^n |P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})(z)|} \\
&\le g^{q-N}(z)h^{n-1}(z)\zeta^{(N-n)(n-1)}(z) \frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^{Nd+(N-n)(n-1)d}}{\prod_{j=1}^n |P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})(z)|^{N-n+1}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $I = (i_1, ..., i_{N+1})$ and ζ is a function in $\mathcal{C}_f$, which is chosen common for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$, such that

$$|P_{Ij}(z)(\omega)| \le \zeta(z)||\omega||^d, \ \forall \omega = (\omega_0, ..., \omega_n) \in \mathbf{C}^{n+1}.$$

The above inequality implies that

(3.2)

$$\log \prod_{i=1}^q \frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d}{|Q_i(\tilde{f})(z)|} \le \log(g^{q-N}h^{n-1}\zeta^{(N-n)(n-1)})(z) + (N-n+1)\log \frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^{nd}}{\prod_{j=1}^n |P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})(z)|}.$$

Now, for each nonegative integer L, we denote by V_L the vector space (over $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}$) consisting of all homogeneous polynomials of degree L in $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ and the zero polynomial. Denote by $(P_{I1}, \ldots, P_{In})$ the ideal in $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ generated by $P_{I1}, \ldots, P_{In}$.

Lemma 3.3 (see [1, Lemma 5], [5, Proposition 3.3]). *Let $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^q$ $(q \ge n+1)$ be a set of homogeneous polynomials of common degree $d \ge 1$ in $\mathcal{K}_f[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ in weakly general position. Then for any nonnegative integer N and for any $J := \{j_1, \ldots, j_n\} \subset \{1, \ldots, q\}$, the dimension of the vector space $\frac{V_L}{(P_{j_1},\ldots,P_{j_n})\cap V_L}$ is equal to the number of n-tuples $(s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathbf{N}_0^n$ such that $s_1 + \cdots + s_n \le L$ and $0 \le s_1, \ldots, s_n \le d-1$. In particular, for all $L \ge n(d-1)$, we have*

$$\dim \frac{V_L}{(P_{j_1}, \ldots, P_{j_n}) \cap V_L} = d^n.$$

For each positive integer L divisible by d and for each $(i) = (i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in \mathbf{N}_0^n$ with $||(i)|| = \sum_{s=1}^n i_s \le \frac{L}{d}$, we set

$$W_{(i)}^I = \sum_{(j)=(j_1,\ldots,j_n)\ge(i)} P_{I1}^{j_1} \cdots P_{In}^{j_n} \cdot V_{L-d||(j)||}.$$

It is clear that $W^I_{(0,\dots,0)} = V_L$ and $W^I_{(i)} \supset W^I_{(j)}$ if $(i) < (j)$ in the lexicographic ordering. Hence, $W^I_{(i)}$ is a filtration of V_L.

Let $(i) = (i_1, \dots, i_n), (i') = (i'_1, \dots, i'_n) \in \mathbf{N}_0^n$. Suppose that (i') follows (i) in the lexicographic ordering. We consider the following vector space homomorphism

$$\varphi : \gamma \in V_{L-d||(i)||} \mapsto [P^{i_1}_{I1} \cdots P^{i_n}_{In}\gamma] \in \frac{W^I_{(i)}}{W^I_{(i')}},$$

where $[P^{i_1}_{I1} \cdots P^{i_n}_{In}\gamma]$ is the equivalent class in $\frac{W^I_{(i)}}{W^I_{(i')}}$ containing $P^{i_1}_{I1} \cdots P^{i_n}_{In}\gamma$. We see that φ is surjective. We will show that $\ker\varphi$ is equal to $(P_{I1}, \dots, P_{In}) \cap V_{L-d||(i)||}$.

In fact, for any $\gamma \in \ker\varphi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P^{i_1}_{I1} \cdots P^{i_n}_{In}\gamma &= \sum_{(j)=(j_1,\dots,j_n)\geq(i')} P^{j_1}_{I1} \cdots P^{j_n}_{In}||(j)|| \\ &= \sum_{(j)=(j_1,\dots,j_n)>(i)} P^{j_1}_{I1} \cdots P^{j_n}_{In}||(j)||, \end{aligned}$$

where $||(j)|| \in V_{L-d||(j)||}$. By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.6, we have $\gamma \in (P_{I1}, \dots, P_{In})$. Then

$$\ker\varphi \subset (P_{I1}, \dots, P_{In}) \cap V_{L-d||(i)||}.$$

Conversely, for any $\gamma \in (P_{I1}, \dots, P_{In}) \cap V_{L-d||(i)||}$, $(\gamma \neq 0)$, we have

$$\gamma = \sum_{s=1}^{n} P_{Is}h_s, \quad h_s \in V_{L-d(||(i)||+1)}.$$

It implies that

$$\varphi(\gamma) = \sum_{s=1}^{n} [P^{i_1}_{I1} \cdots P^{i_s-1}_{Is-1} P^{i_s+1}_{Is} P^{i_s+1}_{Is+1} \cdots P^{i_n}_{In}h_s].$$

It is clear that $P^{i_1}_{I1} \cdots P^{i_s-1}_{Is-1} P^{i_s+1}_{Is} P^{i_s+1}_{Is+1} \cdots P^{i_n}_{In}h_s \in W^I_{(i')}$, and hence $\varphi(\gamma) = 0$, i.e., $\gamma \in \ker\varphi$. Therefore, we have

$$\ker\varphi = (P_{I1}, \dots, P_{In}) \cap V_{L-d||(i)||}.$$

This yields that

$$\dim \frac{W^I_{(i)}}{W^I_{(i')}} = \dim \frac{V_{L-d||(i)||}}{(P_{I1}, \dots, P_{In}) \cap V_{L-d||(i)||}}. \tag{3.4}$$

Fix a number L large enough (chosen later). Set $u = u_L := \dim V_L = \binom{L+n}{n}$. We assume that

$$V_L = W^I_{(i)_1} \supset W^I_{(i)_2} \supset \cdots \supset W^I_{(i)_K},$$

where $W^I_{(i)_{s+1}}$ follows $W^I_{(i)_s}$ in the ordering and $(i)_K = (\frac{L}{d}, 0, \dots, 0)$. It is easy to see that K is the number of n-tuples $(i_1, \dots, i_n)$ with $i_j \geq 0$ and $i_1 + \cdots + i_n \leq \frac{L}{d}$. Then we have

$$K = \binom{\frac{L}{d} + n}{n}.$$

For each $k \in \{1, \ldots, K-1\}$ we set $m_k^I = \dim \frac{W^I_{(i)_k}}{W^I_{(i)_{k+1}}}$, and set $m_k^I = 1$. Then by Lemma 3.5, m_k^I does not depends on $\{P_{I1}, \ldots, P_{In}\}$ and k, but on $||(i)_k||$. Hence, we set $m_k = m^I_{||(i)_k||}$. We also note that

$$m_k = d^n \tag{3.5}$$

for all k with $L - d||(i)_k|| \geq n(d-1)$ (it is equivalent to $||(i)_k|| \leq \dfrac{L}{d} - n$).

From the above filtration, we may choose a basis $\{\psi_1^I, \cdots, \psi_u^I\}$ of V_L such that

$$\{\psi_{u-(m_s+\cdots+m_K)+1}, \ldots, \psi_u^I\}$$

is a basis of $W^I_{(i)_s}$. For each $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ and $l \in \{u - (m_k + \cdots + m_k) + 1, \ldots, u - (m_{k+1} + \cdots + m_k)\}$, we may write

$$\psi_l^I = P_{I1}^{i_{1k}} \cdots P_{In}^{i_{nk}} h_l, \quad \text{where } (i_{1k}, \ldots, i_{nk}) = (i)_k, h_l \in W^I_{L-d||(i)_k||}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_l^I(\tilde{f})(z)| &\leq |P_{I1}(\tilde{f})(z)|^{i_{1k}} \cdots |P_{In}(\tilde{f})(z)|^{i_{nk}} |h(\tilde{f})(z)| \\
&\leq c_l |P_{I1}(\tilde{f})(z)|^{i_{1k}} \cdots |P_{In}(\tilde{f})(z)|^{i_{nk}} ||\tilde{f}(z)||^{L-d||(i)_k||} \\
&= c_l \left(\frac{|P_{I1}(\tilde{f})(z)|}{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d}\right)^{i_{1k}} \cdots \left(\frac{|P_{In}(\tilde{f})(z)|}{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d}\right)^{i_{nk}} ||\tilde{f}(z)||^L,
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_l \in \mathcal{C}_f$, which does not depen on f and z. Taking the product the both sides of the above inequalities over all l and then taking logarithms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \prod_{l=1}^{u} |\psi_l^I(\tilde{f})(z)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{K} m_k \left(i_{1k} \log \frac{|P_{I1}(\tilde{f})(z)|}{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d} + \cdots + i_{nk} \log \frac{|P_{In}(\tilde{f})(z)|}{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d} \right) \\
+ uL \log ||\tilde{f}(z)|| + \log c_I(z),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $c_I = \prod_{l=1}^{q} c_l \in \mathcal{C}_f$, which does not depend on f and z.

We see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} m_k i_{sk} = \sum_{l=0}^{\frac{L}{d}} \sum_{k:||(i)_k||=l} m(l) i_{sk} = \sum_{l=0}^{\frac{L}{d}} m(l) \sum_{k:||(i)_k||=l} i_{sk}.$$

Note that, by the symetry $(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \to (i_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, i_{\sigma(n)})$ with $\sigma \in S(n)$, $\sum_{k:||(i)_k||=l} i_{sk}$ does not depend on s. We set

$$A := \sum_{k=1}^{K} m_k i_{sk}, \quad \text{which is independent of } s \text{ and } I.$$

Hence, (3.6) gives

$$\log \prod_{l=1}^{u} |\psi_l^I(\tilde{f})(z)| \leq A \left(\log \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|P_{Ii}(\tilde{f})(z)|}{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d} \right) + uL \log ||\tilde{f}(z)|| + \log c_I(z),$$

i.e.,

$$A\left(\log\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d}{|P_{Ii}(\tilde{f})(z)|}\right)\le\log\prod_{l=1}^{u}\frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^L}{|\psi_l^I(\tilde{f})(z)|}+\log c_I(z),$$

Set $c_0=g^{q-N}h^{n-1}\zeta^{(N-n)(n-1)}\prod_I(1+c_I^{(N-n+1)/A})\in\mathcal{C}_f$. Combining the above inequality with (3.2), we obtain that

$$\log\prod_{i=1}^{q}\frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d}{|Q_i(\tilde{f})(z)|}\le\frac{N-n+1}{A}\log\prod_{l=1}^{u}\frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^L}{|\psi_l^I(\tilde{f})(z)|}+\log c_0. \tag{3.7}$$

We now write

$$\psi_l^I=\sum_{J\in\mathcal{T}_N}c_{lJ}^I x^J\in V_L,\quad c_{lJ}^I\in\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}},$$

where $\mathcal{T}_L$ is the set of all $(n+1)$-tuples $J=(i_0,\dots,i_n)$ with $\sum_{s=0}^n j_s=L$, $x^J=x_0^{j_0}\cdots x_n^{j_n}$ and $l\in\{1,\dots,u\}$. For each l, we fix an index $J_l^I\in J$ such that $c_{lJ_l^I}^I\not\equiv 0$. Define

$$\mu_{lJ}^I=\frac{c_{lJ}^I}{c_{lJ_l^I}^I},\ J\in\mathcal{T}_L.$$

Set $\Phi=\{\mu_{lJ}^I; I\subset\{1,\dots,q\},\sharp I=n,1\le l\le M,J\in\mathcal{T}_L\}$. Note that $1\in\Phi$. Let $B=\sharp\Phi$. We see that $B\le u\binom{q}{n}(\binom{L+n}{n}-1)=\binom{L+n}{n}(\binom{L+n}{n}-1)\binom{q}{n}$. For each positive integer l, we denote by $\mathcal{L}(\Phi(l))$ the linear span over $\mathbf{C}$ of the set

$$\Phi(l)=\{\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_l;\gamma_i\in\Phi\}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(l))\le\sharp\Phi(l)\le\binom{B+l-1}{B-1}.$$

We may choose a positive integer p such that

$$p\le p_0:=[\frac{B-1}{\log(1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)})}]^2\text{ and }\frac{\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p+1))}{\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p))}\le 1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)}.$$

Indeed, if $\dfrac{\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p+1))}{\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p))}>1+\dfrac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)}$ for all $p\le p_0$, we have

$$\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p_0+1))\ge(1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)})^{p_0}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\log(1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)}) &\leq \frac{\log\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p_0+1))}{p_0} \leq \frac{\log\binom{B+p_0}{B-1}}{p_0}\\ &= \frac{1}{p_0}\log\prod_{i=1}^{B-1}\frac{p_0+i+1}{i} < \frac{(B-1)\log(p_0+2)}{p_0}\\ &\leq \frac{B-1}{\sqrt{p_0}} \leq \frac{(B-1)\log(1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)})}{B-1}\\ &= \log(1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)}).\end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction.

We fix a positive integer p satisfying the above condition. Put $s=\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p))$ and $t=\dim\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p+1))$. Let $\{b_1,\ldots,b_t\}$ be an $\mathbf{C}$-basis of $\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p+1))$ such that $\{b_1,\ldots,b_s\}$ be a $\mathbf{C}$-basis of $\mathcal{L}(\Phi(p))$.

For each $l\in\{1,\ldots,u\}$, we set

$$\tilde{\psi}_l^I=\sum_{J\in\mathcal{T}_N}\mu_{lJ}^I x^I.$$

For each $J\in\mathcal{T}_L$, we consider homogeneous polynomials $\phi_J(x_0,\ldots,x_n)=x^J$. Let F be a meromorphic mapping of $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{P}^{tu-1}(\mathbf{C})$ with a reduced representation $\tilde{F}=(b_i\phi_J(\tilde{f}))_{1\leq i\leq t,J\in\mathcal{T}_N}$ be a meromorphic vector functions from $\mathbf{C}^m$ into $\mathbf{C}^{tu}$. Since f is assumed to be algebraically nondegenerate over $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}$, F is linearly nondegenerate over $\mathbf{C}$. We see that there exist nonzero functions $c_1,c_2\in\mathcal{C}_f$ such that

$$c_1||\tilde{f}||^L\leq||\tilde{F}||\leq c_2||\tilde{f}||^L.$$

For each $l\in\{1,\ldots,u\}, 1\leq i\leq s$, we consider the linear form L_{il}^I in x^J such that

$$b_i\tilde{\psi}_l^I(\tilde{f})=L_{il}^I(\tilde{F}).$$

Since f is algebraically nondegenerate over $\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}$, it is easy to see that $\{b_i\tilde{\psi}_l^I(\tilde{f});1\leq i\leq s,1\leq l\leq M\}$ is linearly independently over $\mathbf{C}$, and so is $\{L_{il}^I(\tilde{F});1\leq i\leq s,1\leq l\leq M\}$. This yields that $\{L_{il}^I;1\leq i\leq s,1\leq l\leq M\}$ is linearly independent over $\mathbf{C}$. We also see that

$$\begin{aligned}s\log\prod_{l=1}^u\frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^L}{|\psi_l^I(\tilde{f})(z)|} &= \log\prod_{\substack{1\leq l\leq u\\1\leq i\leq s}}\frac{||\tilde{F}(z)||}{|b_i\psi_l^I(\tilde{f})(z)|}+\log c_3(z)\\ &= \log\prod_{\substack{1\leq l\leq u\\1\leq i\leq s}}\frac{||\tilde{F}(z)||\cdot||L_{il}^I||}{|L_{il}^I(\tilde{F})(z)|}+\log c_4(z),\end{aligned}$$

where c_3, c_4 are nonzero functions in $\mathcal{C}_f$, not depend on f and I, but on $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^q$. Combining this inequality and (3.7), we obtain that

(3.8)
$$\log\prod_{i=1}^{q}\frac{||\tilde{f}(z)||^d}{|Q_i(\tilde{f})(z)|}\leq\frac{N-n+1}{sA}\left(\max_I\log\prod_{\substack{1\leq l\leq u\\1\leq i\leq s}}\frac{||\tilde{F}(z)||\cdot||L_{il}^I||}{|L_{il}^I(\tilde{F})(z)|}+\log c_4(z)\right)+\log c_0(z).$$

Since $\tilde{F}$ is linearly nondegenerate over $\mathbf{C}$, there exists an admissible set $\alpha=(\alpha_{iJ})_{\substack{1\leq i\leq t\\J\in\mathcal{T}_N}}$ with $\alpha_{iJ}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^m$, $||\alpha_{iJ}||\leq tu-1$. such that

$$W^\alpha(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))=\det\left(\mathcal{D}^{\alpha_{i'J'}}(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))\right)\not\equiv 0.$$

By Theorem 2.4, we have

$$\Big|\Big|\int\limits_{S(r)}\max_I\left\{\log\prod_{\substack{1\leq l\leq u\\1\leq i\leq s}}\frac{||\tilde{F}(z)||\cdot||L_{il}^I||}{|L_{il}^I(\tilde{F})(z)|}\right\}\leq tuT_F(r)-N_{W^\alpha(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))}(r)+o(T_F(r)). \tag{3.9}$$

Integrating both sides of (3.8) and using (3.9), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}qdT_f(r)-\sum_{i=1}^{q}N(r,f^*Q_i)\leq&\frac{tu(N-n+1)}{sA}T_F(r)-\frac{N-n+1}{sA}N_{W^\alpha(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))}(r)\\&+o(T_F(r)+T_f(r)).\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

We now estimate the quantity $\sum_{i=1}^q N(r,f^*Q_i)-\frac{N-n+1}{sA}N_{W^\alpha(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))}(r)$. Fix a point $z_0\in\mathbf{C}^m$. Without lose of generality, we may assume that

$$\nu_{Q_1(\tilde{f})}(z_0)\geq\cdots\geq\nu_{Q_N(\tilde{f})}(z_0)\geq\cdots\geq\nu_{Q_q(\tilde{f})}(z_0).$$

First, we recall that

$$Q_i(x)=\sum_{J\in\mathcal{T}_d}a_{iJ}x^I\in\mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}[x_0,\ldots,x_n].$$

Let $T=(\cdots,t_{kJ},\cdots)$ $(k\in\{1,\ldots,q\},J\in\mathcal{T}_d)$ be a family of variables and

$$Q_i^T=\sum_{J\in\mathcal{T}_d}T_{iJ}x^I\in\mathbf{Z}[T,x],\quad i=1,\ldots,q.$$

For each ordered subset $I=(i_1,...,i_{N+1})\subset\{1,\ldots,q\}$, we denote by $\tilde{R}_I\in\mathbf{Z}[T]$ the resultant of $\{Q_i^T\}_{i\in I}$. Then there exists a positive integer λ (common for all I) and polynomials $\tilde{b}_{ij}^I$ $(0\leq i\leq n,j\in I)$ in $\mathbf{Z}[T,x]$, which are zero or homogeneous in x with degree of $\lambda-d$ such that

$$x_i^\lambda\cdot\tilde{R}_I=\sum_{j\in I}\tilde{b}_{ij}^IQ_j^T\ \text{ for all } i\in\{1,\ldots,q\},$$

and $R_I=\tilde{R}_I(\ldots,a_{kJ},\ldots)\not\equiv 0$. We see that $R_I\in\mathcal{K}_f$. Set

$$b_{ij}^I=\tilde{b}_{ij}^I((\ldots,a_{jJ},\ldots),(x_0,\ldots,x_n)).$$

Then we have

$$f_i^\lambda \cdot R_I = \sum_{j\in H} b_{ij}^I(\tilde{f})Q_j(\tilde{f}) \ \text{ for all } i \in \{0,\dots,n\}.$$

This implies that

$$\nu_{R_I} \geq \min_{j\in I} \nu_{Q_j(\tilde{f})} + \min_{0\leq i\leq n, j\in I} \nu_{b_{ij}^I(\tilde{f})}.$$

We set $R = \prod_{I\subset\{1,\dots,q\}} R_I \in \mathcal{K}_{\{Q_i\}}$. It is easy to see that

$$\nu_{b_{ij}^I(\tilde{f})} \geq O(\min_{k,J} \nu_{a_{kJ}}),$$

and the left hand side of this inequality is only depend on $\{Q_i\}$. Then it implies that there exists a constant c, which depends only on $\{Q_i\}$, such that

$$\min_{j\in I} \nu_{Q_j(f)} \leq \nu_R - c\min_{k,J} \nu_{a_{kJ}},$$

for each ordered subset $I \subset \{1,\dots,q\}$ with $\sharp I = N+1$.

Now, we let $I = \{1,...,N+1\} \subset \{1,\dots,q\}$. Then

$$\nu_{Q_j(f)}(z_0) \leq \nu_R(z_0) - c\min_{k,J} \nu_{a_{kJ}}(z_0),\ j = N+1,...,q.$$

Also it is easy to see that

$$\nu_{Q_{N-n+i}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) \leq \nu_{P_{Ii}}(z_0),$$

and hence

$$\nu_{Q_{N-n+i}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{Q_{N-n+i}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) \leq \nu_{P_{Ii}}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{P_{Ii}}(z_0),\ i = 2,...,n.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{q}(\nu_{Q_i(\tilde{f})}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{Q_i(\tilde{f})}(z_0)) &\leq (N-n+1)(\nu_{Q_1(\tilde{f})}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{Q_1(\tilde{f})}(z_0)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^{n}(\nu_{P_{Ii}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{P_{Ii}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)) + (q-N)\nu_{Q_{N+1}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) \\
&\leq (N-n+1)\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\nu_{P_{Ii}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{P_{Ii}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)) \\
&\quad + (q-N)(\nu_R(z_0) - c\min_{k,J} \nu_{a_{kJ}}(z_0)).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Take linear forms h_{il}^I in x^J, $1 \leq l \leq u, s+1 \leq i \leq t, J \in \mathcal{T}_L$ such that $\{L_{il}^I; 1 \leq l \leq u, 1 \leq i \leq s\} \cup \{h_{il}^I; 1 \leq l \leq u, s+1 \leq i \leq t\}$ is linearly independent over $\mathbf{C}$. Moreover,

we easily see that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{W^\alpha(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))}(z_0) &= \nu_{W^\alpha(L^I_{il}(\tilde{f}),\dots,h^I_{il}(\tilde{f}))}(z_0)\\ &\geq \sum_{\substack{1\leq l\leq u\\ 1\leq i\leq s}}\Big(\nu_{L^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)-\nu^{[tu-1]}_{L^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)\Big)\\ &\geq \sum_{\substack{1\leq l\leq u\\ 1\leq i\leq s}}\Big(\nu_{b_i\tilde{\psi}^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)-\nu^{[tu-1]}_{b_i\tilde{\psi}^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)\Big)\\ &\geq \sum_{\substack{1\leq l\leq u\\ 1\leq i\leq s}}\Big(\nu_{\tilde{\psi}^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)-\nu^{[tu-1]}_{\tilde{\psi}^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)\Big)-C\max_{1\leq i\leq s}\nu^\infty_{b_i}(z_0),\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

where C is a positive constant, which is chosen indenpendently of I, since there are only finite ordered subset I.

Now for integers x, y, we easily see that

$$\max\{0, x+y-L\}\geq \max\{0,x-L\}+\min\{0,y\}.$$

It yields that

$$\nu_{\varphi_1\varphi_2}(z)-\nu^{[L]}_{\varphi_1\varphi_2}(z)\geq \nu_{\varphi_1}(z)-\nu^{[L]}_{\varphi_1}(z)-\nu^\infty_{\varphi_2}(z),\tag{3.13}$$

for every nonzero meromorphic functions φ_1, φ_2. If let $x_1,\dots,x_{k_1}$ be k_1 nonegative integers and let $y_1,\dots,y_{k_2}$ be k_2 negative integers, then we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\max\{0,x_1+\cdots+x_{k_1}+y_1+\cdots+y_{k_2}-L\} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_1}\max\{0,x_i-L\}+\sum_{i=1}^{k_2}\min\{0,y_i\}\\ &=\sum_{i=1}^{k_1}(\max\{0,x_i-L\}+\min\{0,x_i\})+\sum_{i=1}^{k_2}(\max\{0,y_i-L\}+\min\{0,y_i\}).\end{aligned}$$

This yields that

$$\nu_{\prod_{i=1}^k\varphi_i}(z)-\nu^{[L]}_{\prod_{i=1}^k\varphi_i}(z)\geq\sum_{i=1}^k(\nu_{\varphi_i}(z)-\nu^{[L]}_{\varphi_i}(z)-\nu^\infty_{\varphi_i}(z)),\tag{3.14}$$

for any meromorphic functions φ_i $(1\leq i\leq k)$.

For each $1\leq l\leq u, 1\leq i\leq s$ we have

$$\tilde{\psi}^I_l(\tilde{f})=\frac{1}{c^I_{lJ^I_l}}\prod_{j=1}^n P^{i_{jk}}_{Ij}(\tilde{f})h_l(\tilde{f}),$$

where $(i_{1k},\dots,i_{nk})=I_k, h_l\in V_{L-d||(i)_k||}$ and h_l is independent of f. Now using (3.13) and (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{\tilde{\psi}^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)-\nu^{[tu-1]}_{\tilde{\psi}^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) &\geq \nu_{\prod_{j=1}^n P^{i_{jk}}_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z)-\nu^{[tu-1]}_{\prod_{j=1}^n P^{i_{jk}}_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z)-\nu_{c^I_{lJ^I_l}}(z_0)\\ &\geq\sum_{j=1}^n i_{jk}(\nu_{P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z)-\nu^{[tu-1]}_{P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z))-c_1\max_{j,J}\nu_{a_{jJ}}(z_0).\end{aligned}$$

where c_1 is a constant, which depends only on $\{Q_i\}, t$ and L. Summing-up both sides of the above inequalities over all $1 \le i \le u, 1 \le l \le s$, we get

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le u\\ 1\le l\le s}} (\nu_{\tilde{\psi}^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{\tilde{\psi}^I_{il}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)) \ge \sum_{j=1}^{n} s \sum_{k=1}^{K} m^I_k i_{jk} (\nu_{P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z_0)) - c_2 \max_{j,J} \nu_{a_{jJ}},$$

$$= As \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\nu_{P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z)) - c_2 \max_{j,J} \nu_{a_{jJ}}, \tag{3.15}$$

where c_2 is a constant, which depends only on $\{Q_i\}, t$ and L.

Combining (3.12) and (3.15), we get

$$\nu_{W^\alpha(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))}(z_0) \ge As \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\nu_{P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{P_{Ij}(\tilde{f})}(z)) - c_2 \max_{j,J} \nu_{a_{jJ}} - C \max_{1\le i\le s} \nu^{\infty}_{b_i}(z_0).$$

Combining (3.11) and this inequality, we obtain

$$\frac{N-n+1}{As} \nu_{W^\alpha(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))}(z_0) \ge \sum_{i=1}^{q} (\nu_{Q_i(\tilde{f})}(z_0) - \nu^{[tu-1]}_{Q_i(\tilde{f})}(z_0)) - (N-n+1)(q-N)(\nu_R(z_0)$$
$$+ c \max_{1\le k\le q} \nu_{a_{kJ_k}}(z_0)) - \frac{N-n+1}{As}(c_2 \max_{j,J} \nu_{a_{jJ}} + C \max_{1\le i\le s} \nu^{\infty}_{b_i}(z_0)).$$

Integrating both sides of the above inequality, we obtain that

$$\| \frac{N-n+1}{As} N_{W^\alpha(b_i\tilde{\phi}_J(\tilde{f}))}(r) \ge \sum_{i=1}^{q} (N_{Q_i(\tilde{f})}(r) - N^{[tu-1]}_{Q_i(\tilde{f})}(r)) + o(T_f(r)).$$

From this inequality and (3.10) with a note that $T_F(r) = LT_f(r) + o(T_f(r))$, we have

$$\| (q - \frac{tuL(N-n+1)}{dAs}) T_f(r) \le \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d} N^{[tu-1]}(r, f^*Q_i) + o(T_f(r)). \tag{3.16}$$

Now we give some estimates for A, t and s. For each $I_k = (i_{1k}, \ldots, i_{nk})$ with $||(i)_k|| \le \frac{L}{d} - n$, we set

$$i_{(n+1)k} = \frac{L}{d} - n - \sum_{s=1}^{n} i_s.$$

Since the number of nonnegative integer p-tuples with summation $\le T$ is equal to the number of nonnegative integer $(p+1)$-tuples with summation exactly equal to $T \in \mathbf{Z}$, which is $\binom{T+n}{n}$, and since the sum below is independent of s, we have

$$A = \sum_{||(i)_k||\le \frac{L}{d}} m^I_k i_{sk} \ge \sum_{||(i)_k||\le \frac{L}{d}-n} m^I_k i_{sk} = \frac{d^n}{n+1} \sum_{||(i)_k||\le \frac{L}{d}-n} \sum_{s=1}^{n+1} i_{sk}$$
$$= \frac{d^n}{n+1} \cdot \binom{\frac{L}{d}}{n} \cdot (\frac{L}{d} - n) = d^n \binom{\frac{L}{d}}{n+1}.$$

Now, for every positive number $x \in [0, \frac{1}{(n+1)^2}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(1+x)^n &= 1+nx+\sum_{i=2}^{n}\binom{n}{i}x^i \le 1+nx+\sum_{i=1}^{2}\frac{n^i}{i!(n+1)^{2i-2}}x \\ &= 1+nx+\sum_{i=2}^{n}\frac{1}{i!}x \le 1+(n+1)x.\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

We chose $L = (n+1)d + 2(N-n+1)(n+1)^3 I(\epsilon^{-1})d$. Then L is divisible by d and we have

$$\frac{(n+1)d}{L-(n+1)d} = \frac{(n+1)d}{2(N-n+1)(n+1)^3 I(\epsilon^{-1})d} \le \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2}. \tag{3.18}$$

Therefore, using (3.17) and (3.18) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{uL}{dA} &\le \frac{\binom{L+n}{n}L}{d^{n+1}\binom{\frac{L}{d}}{n+1}} = \frac{L\cdot(L+1)\cdots(L+n)}{1\cdot 2\cdots n}\Big/\frac{(L-nd)\cdot(L-(n-1)d)\cdots L}{1\cdot 2\cdots(n+1)} \\ &= (n+1)\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{L+i}{L-(n-i+1)d} < (n+1)\Big(\frac{L}{L-(n+1)d}\Big)^n \\ &= (n+1)\left(1+\frac{(n+1)d}{L-(n+1)d}\right)^n < (n+1)\left(1+\frac{(n+1)^2 d}{2(N-n+1)(n+1)^3 I(\epsilon^{-1})d}\right) \\ &\le (n+1)+\frac{(n+1)^3 d}{2(n+1)^3(N-n+1)\epsilon^{-1}} \le n+1+\frac{\epsilon}{2(N-n+1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{tuL}{dAs} &\le (1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)})(n+1+\frac{\epsilon}{2(N-n+1)}) \\ &\le n+1+\frac{\epsilon}{2(N-n+1)}+\frac{\epsilon}{3(N-n+1)}+\frac{\epsilon}{6(N-n+1)} \\ &= n+1+\frac{\epsilon}{N-n+1}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Combining (3.11) and (3.19), we get

$$(q-(N-n+1)(n+1)-\epsilon)\,T_f(r) \le \sum_{i=1}^{q}\frac{1}{d}N^{[tu-1]}(r, f^*Q_i) + o(T_f(r)). \tag{3.20}$$

Here we note that:

- $L := (n+1)d + 2(N-n+1)(n+1)^3 I(\epsilon^{-1})d$,
- $p_0 := \left[\dfrac{B-1}{\log(1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)})}\right]^2 \le \left[\dfrac{\binom{L+n}{n}(\binom{L+n}{n}-1)\binom{q}{n}-1}{\log(1+\frac{\epsilon}{3(n+1)(N-n+1)})}\right]^2$,
- $tu-1 \le \binom{L+n}{n}\binom{B+p}{B-1}-1 \le \binom{L+n}{n}p^{B-1}-1 \le \binom{L+n}{n}p_0^{\binom{L+n}{n}(\binom{L+n}{n}-1)\binom{q}{n}-2}-1 = L_0.$

By these estimates and by (3.20), we obtain

$$|| \ (q-(N-n+1)(n+1)-\epsilon)T_f(r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d} N^{[L_0]}(r, f^*Q_i) + o(T_f(r)).$$

The theorem is proved. □

Acknowledgements. This research is funded by Vietnam National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED) under grant number 101.04-2015.03.

References

[1] T. T. H. An and H. T. Phuong, *An explicit estimate on multiplicity truncation in the Second Main Theorem for holomorphic curves encountering hypersurfaces in general position in projective space,* Houston J. Math. **35** (2009) 775–786.
[2] H. Cartan, *Sur les zéroes des combinaisons linéaries de p fonctions holomorphes données,* Mathematica **7** (1933) 80–103.
[3] Z. Chen, M. Ru and Q. Yan, *The truncated second main theorem and uniqueness theorems*, Sci. China Math. **53** (2010) 605–616.
[4] P. Corvaja and U. Zannier, *On a general Thue's equation,* Amer. J. Math. **126** (2004) 1033–1055.
[5] G. Dethloff and T. V. Tan, A second main theorem for moving hypersurface targets, Houston J. Math. 37 (2011) 79-111.
[6] H. Fujimoto, *Non-integrated defect relation for meromorphic maps of complete Kähler manifolds into* $\mathbb{P}^{N_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times ... \times \mathbb{P}^{N_k}(\mathbb{C})$, Japanese J. Math. **11** 233–264 (1985).
[7] L. Giang, *An explicit estimate on multiplicity truncation in the degenerated second main theorem,* Houston J. Math. **42** (2016) 447–462.
[8] R. Nevanlinna, *Einige Eideutigkeitssätze in der Theorie der meromorphen Funktionen*, Acta. Math. **48** (1926) 367–391.
[9] E. I. Nochka, *On the theory of meromorphic functions*, Sov. Math. Dokl. **27** (1983) 377–381.
[10] Noguchi, J., Ochiai, T, Introduction to Geometric Function Theory in Several Complex Variables, Trans. Math. Monogr. 80, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, 1990.
[11] J. Noguchi, *A note on entire pseudo-holomorphic curves and the proof of Cartan-Nochka's theorem*, Kodai Math. J. **28** 336–346 (2005).
[12] S. D. Quang, *Second main theorem and unicity theorem for meromorphic mappings sharing moving hypersurfaces regardless of multiplicity*, Bull. Sci. Math. **136** (2012), 399–412.
[13] S. D. Quang, *Second main theorems and unicity of meromorphic mappings with moving hypersurfaces*, Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie **57** (105) No. 3 (2014) 279–300.
[14] S. D. Quang, *Degeneracy second main theorems for meromorphic mappings into projective varieties with hypersurfaces*, arXiv:1610.03951 [math.CV].
[15] S. D. Quang and D. P . An, *Second main theorem and unicity of meromorphic mappings for hypersurfaces in projective varieties,* to appear in Acta Mathematica Vietnamica (2016).
[16] M. Ru, *On the general form of second main theorem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **49** (1997), 5093-5105.
[17] M. Ru, *A defect relation for holomorphic curves intersecting hypersurfaces,* Amer. J. Math. **126** (2004) 215–226.
[18] M. Ru and W. Stoll, *The second main theorem for moving targets*, J. Geom. Anal. **1** (1991), 99–138.
[19] M. Ru and W. Stoll, *The Cartan conjecture for moving targets*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **52** (1991), 99–138.
[20] M. Shirosaki, *Another proof of the defect relation for moving targets*, Tôhoku Math. J. **43** (1991), 355–360.
[21] D. D. Thai and S. D. Quang, *Cartan-Nochka theorems with truncated counting function for moving targets,* Acta Math. Vietnamica, **35** (2010), 173–197.

Si Duc Quang
[1] Department of Mathematics, Hanoi National University of Education,
136-Xuan Thuy, Cau Giay, Hanoi, Vietnam.
[2] Thang Long Institute of Mathematics and Applied Sciences,
Nghiem Xuan Yem, Hoang Mai, HaNoi, Vietnam.
E-mail: quangsd@hnue.edu.vn